

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/493,750	01/28/2000	Purnendu Shekhar Ojha	NXTGP001X2	2623	
22434	7590 08/27/2004		EXAMINER		
BEYER WE	AVER & THOMAS LL	P	NGUYEN, CUONG H		
	CA 94704-0778		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			3625		

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/493,750	OJHA ET AL.	6
Auvis	ory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
		CUONG H. NGUYEN	3625	
The MAILING D	ATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
final rejection under 37 C condition for allowance; (	FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP by the applicant is required to a FR 1.113 may only be either: (1 2) a timely filed Notice of Appea mpliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	<ol> <li>a timely filed amendment whi</li> </ol>	cation. A proper repich places the application	cation in
	PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
	expires <u>3 months from the mailing date of</u>			
event, however, will the ONLY CHECK THIS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be a have been filed is the date for put 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from	expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advine statutory period for reply expire later the BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data proses of determining the period of extensin: (1) the expiration date of the shortened received by the Office later than three modes are considered to the shortened received by the Office later than three modes are considered.	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.5 sion and the corresponding amount of the late of th	of the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. Solution of the appropriate extending the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
	I was filed on Appellant'or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed ame	endment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) 🗌 they raise nev	vissues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the	issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) ☐ they are not d issues for app	eemed to place the application in eal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present	additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
NOTE:	<u>.</u>			
3. Applicant's reply h	as overcome the following rejec	ction(s):		
	amended claim(s) would allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, application in cond	b) exhibit, or c) request fo dition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>	r reconsideration has been consecutions	sidered but does NO	OT place the
	hibit will NOT be considered be	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Ap	opeal, the proposed amendment of the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the o	laim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected	to:			
Claim(s) rejected:	<u>1,4,6-26</u> .			
Claim(s) withdraw	n from consideration:			
8. The drawing correct	ction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9.  Note the attached	Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	_	/
10. Other:		, ,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
			CUONO H. NGUY Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3625	upn EN
S. Patent and Trademark Office	<del></del>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 tr C7 III. CO2O	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) ļ

1

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Tull, Kovski, Walker, Wilton and Conklin read on pending claims; further more, the applicants do not correctly challenge the old and well-known facts that used as Official Notices in the Office Action and the Applicants incorrectly conclude that the Examiner's obligations are not fulfilled (in responding an Office Action, applicants should challenge specifically on what are considered as old and well-known fact in the claimed limitation).